UAW's Mazey on Foreign Policy, P. 3

Hopeful Stirrings of Revolt on the Peace Front Within the Democratic Party, Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VIII, NO. 15 APRIL 18, 1960 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Moscow Trying to Keep Peking Out of the Nuclear Club

A courageous speech on "American Policy Toward Communist China" was made by Senator Joseph S. Clark (*D. Pa.*) before the American Academy of Political and Social Science in Philadelphia April 8, and generally ignored by the press though it contained two striking items of news. One was Senator Clark's disclosure that when he inquired the State Department had advised him "that in the 97 meetings held in Warsaw between our Ambassador, Jacob D. Beam, and Chinese Communist Ambassador Wong Ping Nan since August 1, 1955, China's participation in a nuclear test ban control system or in general disarmament accords has never been discussed" although 23 of the 37 control posts to be located in Asia under the 1958 Geneva test agreement are to be located on the China mainland. Senator Clark pointed out that "if the Soviets agree to the US-UK draft provisions, a start on the establishment of control posts in countries such as China which are 'adjacent or contiguous' to the territory of the signatory powers will be required within two years of the treaty." He urged that we use the Warsaw talks, or preferably new contacts at a higher level, to sound out Chinese views and in addition place the question on the agenda of the summit conference.

Advanced Reactors Refused by Russia

The speech also contained a related but more sensational item of news. "There is little to indicate," Senator Clark said, "that the Soviet Union is anxious to have its Communist partner join the nuclear club. True, in 1955, the Soviets signed an agreement with the Chinese on scientific and technical cooperation, *but it is now established that the Russians have refused recent Chinese requests for advanced reactors and other nuclear materials necessary to speed the Chinese nuclear development program.*" (Our italics.)

The Senator did not amplify this information in his speech. All his office would say was that it had come from official U.S. sources. In tracking it down, I obtained more details but I cannot disclose their source other than to say that earlier in the week there became available in Congressional circles a study for intelligence purposes into the nuclear relations between Moscow and Peking. This turned up no evidence that Moscow was sharing nuclear weapons or passing along weapons technology to Peking. On the contrary, it was learned that in April 1958 a Chinese Communist delegation offered cash in full payment for a power reactor in Moscow and was told there were none available. Soviet reluctance to see Peking emerge as a nuclear power was also seen in a statement made by Mikoyan Feb. 13 to a Norwegian Students Association meeting in Oslo. "We wish to forbid all atomic tests," Mikoyan said. "If there will be no agreement on this, China may have atomic weapons. The sooner we get an agreement, the greater are the chances that there will be no more explosions."

Peking Cool to "Atom Free" Pacific

The same study showed that Peking has been cool to the idea of an "atom free zone" for the Pacific. This originated with a Japanese socialist at the Afro-Asian solidarity conference at Cairo in December, 1957. The idea was warmly greeted by virtually all the delegations present except the Chinese Communists. *Pravda,* in its report on the conference, featured prominently the idea of the atom free zone but Peking throughout 1958 treated it with reserve and ambiguity. Khrushchov told the 21st Party Congress in January 1959 "a zone of peace, above all an atom-free zone, can and must be created in the Far East and the entire Pacific basin." *An atom free Far East implies that neither Peking nor Tokyo would have atomic arms.* Chou En-lai was present but ignored this suggestion. Only once during 1959 did a high Chinese official endorse the Khrushchov proposal, but that was in a Soviet not a Chinese journal. More recently Chou En-lai did give some support to the idea of an atom free zone to cover all *East* Asia and the Pacific. But Peking has made no commitment to deny itself the possession and use of nuclear weapons irrespective of Moscow's desires. The evidence indicates that Peking's attitude is much like de Gaulle's—it wants an independent nuclear capability to increase its weight in the world balance of power. Moscow seems as unwilling to see China emerge from a safely junior role as we are to see this happen with de Gaulle. The evidence indicates that China can without Russian help produce enough plutonium for a nuclear device from its present reactor within two to four years but at the expense of diversified experimental and scientific training use of the scarce material.

A Common Russo-American Interest

When that first Chinese nuclear device is exploded, it will mean new headaches in Washington and Moscow. The Formosan question will take on a new virulence. For Moscow, Mao Tse-tung will become a Tito and a de Gaulle rolled into one, and several times magnified. The two nuclear giants have a common interest in preventing the emergence of a third, potentially greater, rival. It is in the shadow of this new peril that Senator Clark warned that our China policy has become obsolete. "A political lag between established policies and the needs of the day," he told the Academy, "is always dangerous. When there is a clear challenge in a field affecting national safety and survival and there are literally no government policies to meet that challenge, it is frightening."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hopeful Developments on the Peace Front Within the Democratic Party

Fulbright Says Senate Could Confirm Nuclear Testing Treaty by July

Beside the Clark speech discussed on page one, we report a number of hopeful developments which show a growing revolt within the Democratic party against the stale cold war postures of the Truman-Acheson leadership:

1. Senator Fulbright (*D. Ark.*), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, rose in the Senate April 6 to assure the President that if a treaty banning nuclear tests were agreed upon at the summit in May "it could be acted upon by the Senate by early July". Senator Fulbright said that the advantage of early action would be to take the issue out of the campaign and give the new President "a firm basis" on which to continue efforts toward disarmament.*

Proxmire Against Nuclear Give-Away

2. Senator Proxmire (*D. Wis*) has introduced in the Senate the Kowalski resolution for four power negotiations (US, Soviet, British and French) to prohibit the transfer of nuclear weapons or secrets to other nations. This resolution now has 18 sponsors in the House, all Democrats. The four new ones since our earlier report (*Weekly*, Mar. 14) are Vanik (*Ohio*), Harmon (*Ind*), Karth (*Minn*) and McGovern (*S.Dak*).

3. Although the President is for an agreement to end testing, not a single Republican has yet joined in as co-sponsor of H. Con. Res. 573 by Clem Miller (*D. Cal*), which cites the UN resolution last year against a resumption of testing and asks our government to extend the present moratorium. To the list of 21 sponsors we published in our issue of Feb. 15 there have now been added four more: Cohelan (*Cal*), Levering (*Ohio*), Teller (*N.Y.*) and Holtzman (*N.Y.*).

4. The Democratic Advisory Council, whose Science Advisory Committee has been so helpful on the nuclear test cessation issue, has added a new advisory committee (see box below) to plan for an economy of peace.

5. When the American Chemical Society meeting in Cleveland last week-end was used by the Army further to prepare the public mind for chemical and bacteriological warfare, ten members of Congress (see box above), sent the Society a wire of warning. Again, all ten were Democrats.

6. Governor Meyner (*D. N.J.*) in a series of recent speeches has taken the offensive against the delusions fostered by Governor Rockefeller's shelter program, and called for a vigorous search for peace. "Let's test the Russians," he told an audience in California Mar. 9, "instead of testing the bombs."

On the other side of the fence in the Democratic party, Lyndon Johnson gave the *Baltimore Sun* an interview (April 9) taking a dim view of a nuclear test cessation agreement. He and Symington (like Truman and Acheson) represent the arms race forces. Stevenson, Humphrey, Kennedy, Fulbright, Clark, Proxmire and Meyner are among the elements which offer leadership for peace within the Democratic party.

Ten Democrats Speak Up on CBR

"Gratified that American Chemical Society is publicizing problems of chemical and biological warfare and defense against it. Believe that planning for defense against chemical and biological weapons may well need more effort and money. Would suggest, however, that certain problems arise in present state of American policy and world opinion.

"So long as the U.S. has not taken formal position reaffirming national purpose never to use these weapons unless first used by an enemy, and so long as CBR defense and offense are both centered in Army Chemical Corps, much of world will be uneasy about our intentions if we increase budget for CBR defense.

"Would suggest therefore that Chemical Society explore possibility of separating offensive from defensive research in chemical and biological war, possibly giving task of defense to Public Health Service. Suggest also that Chemical Society press for reaffirmation of American policy against first use of these weapons, as prerequisite for world understanding of our interest in CBR-defense program."

—Wire by 10 Democratic Congressmen April 8 to American Chemical Society meeting in Cleveland signed by Kastenmeier (Wis), Green (Ore), Hechler (W.Va.), Johnson (Col), Kowalski (Conn), Meyer (Vt), Clem Miller (Cal), Porter (Ore), Roosevelt (Cal) and Wier (Minn).

***Since the Foreign Relations Committee, if it were headed by a hostile chairman, could block swift action on a treaty, Fulbright's statement was news of first importance. The New York Times, which consistently underplays or omits news which points hopefully toward a nuclear agreement, ignored the story in its own out of town editions and brushed it off with a few paragraphs buried in another story in its Late City Edition April. 7.**

Democratic Advisory Council Sets Up Group to Study Economics of Peace

"Just as it is necessary for a nation to prepare for war, so also must a nation prepare for peace. . . . We believe that peace is attainable. We are particularly encouraged by the knowledge, which came to us through a study of our Advisory Committee on Science and Technology, that it is possible to develop a system of detecting nuclear explosions down to very low yields. . . . We are encouraged that the prospects for a treaty banning nuclear tests appear brighter. It is necessary that we prepare now for a planned transition to a peaceful economy. . . .

"We shall attempt to apply creative thinking toward the use of all our resources in developing the underdeveloped areas of our own and other lands. . . . We plan to organize our committee along the lines of the Livermore and Manhattan projects. Scientists of various skills will work not in separate cubby-holes but together as a team in attacking the problems before them. . . . We are choosing for this job physical and biological scientists, economists, historians and other social scientists and humanists. We will put them together to apply their joint backgrounds and skills to this project which may prove to be the Number One problem of the new decade."

—Newly established Committee on the Economics of Peace for the Democratic Advisory Council. Co-chairmen: Dr. Polykarp Kusch (1955 Nobel Prize Winner in Physics) of Columbia and Dr. Seymour E. Harris, economist, of Harvard. Other members: Dr. H. Bentley Glass, biology, Johns Hopkins; Dr. Richard A. Lester, economics, Princeton; Dr. Isador Lubin, economics, Rutgers; Dr. F. T. McClure, physics, Johns Hopkins; Dr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., history, Harvard.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Emil Mazey Lifts Curtain on Labor's Timidity in the Quemoy-Matsu Crisis of 1955

UAW's No. 2 Top Man Calls for New China Policy in Search for Peace

By Emil Mazey
Secretary-Treasurer, United Auto Workers

As contrasting backdrop to the pre-summit foreign policy meeting to be held in New York April 18-19 by the AFL-CIO under Meany-Lovestone control, we present here an abridged version of a speech on "Labor's Stake in Peace" made in Chicago Feb. 20 at a meeting under the auspices of the American Friends Service Committee (300 W. Congress Parkway, Chicago 7, Ill.) by Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the United Auto Workers. So little publicity has been given this outspoken speech in the U.S. that our first knowledge of it came from an article in The Tribune of London by Fenner Brockway. Reprints of the Mazey speech may be obtained from the AFSC in Chicago.

Labor leaders have been reluctant to speak out on Foreign Policy issues because of the fear of being labelled soft on Communism. To emphasize this timidity on the part of the labor movement, I wish to point out that in February of 1955, during the Matsu and Quemoy Island disputes, I raised the subject matter at a closed meeting of the CIO Executive Board, and expressed my deep concern for policies that could lead to World War III. I did not ask the CIO to take a position, but urged them to re-evaluate our attitude towards the entire China crisis. I was shocked when a motion was made to expunge my remarks from the record and was even more shocked when a majority of the Board supported this action.

I am sure that what I have to say today will be unpopular with some labor leaders and among some of the politicians in this country, but I am going to express my views whether anybody likes what I have to say or not.

Too Much Brass on the Gravy Train

I find it difficult to know what the truth is concerning our defenses against possible nuclear warfare because of the conflicting views and opinions of men in public life and of our military leaders. It becomes even more difficult for a layman to evaluate the seriousness of our defense posture because so many former generals and admirals now occupy key positions at scandalous salaries for companies engaged in defense production that it is hard to know whether our military leaders are expressing honest, patriotic views or are merely making a pitch for a post-service job.

An additional difficulty is the vested interest that many corporations have in the continuation of the cold war. Over 90% of all the aircraft production in our country is for military purposes and the only customer is Uncle Sam. The end of the cold war could be the end of their business.

Workers engaged in military production also have a vested right [sic] in the continuation of the cold war because our government has no plans on how to use the defense plants for peacetime production and how to adequately guarantee full employment to workers engaged in military production.

During World War II, any worker who was warm, was able to get a job, despite his age, sex or color of his skin. Many of them were heard to remark, 'I hope the war lasts forever.' This comment is understandable, especially after the worker has been plagued with unemployment, insecurity and want, many of them from the dark days of 1930 depression.

In preparing my remarks for this meeting tonight, I have done more reading and more studying of the defense needs of our nation than in any other period of my life. After reading and studying these numerous proposals, I am more alarmed than ever that World War III might start as a result of an accident, a crash of a plane loaded with atomic weapons, or by some trigger-happy Colonel. I have reached the conclusion that there is no alternative to peace.

I believe that we must work towards universal disarmament and be more flexible in our discussions with the Russians on this subject. Our government must also establish a National Planning Board for the peaceful use of our military plants. This proposal is now new. Walter Reuther, president of the UAW, proposed after World War II the use of our aircraft plants to produce housing on a mass production basis.

What A Mere One Percent Could Do

If only one percent of the $175,000,000,000 that is annually spent for military purposes [by all nations] was used to wipe out hunger and raise living standards, we would have $1,750,000,000 available for these purposes.

I believe that no meaningful discussion towards universal disarmament can be achieved with our present policy towards Red China. I urge a complete re-evaluation of our Foreign Policy towards China on a realistic and objective basis. I believe that tensions with China and with other sections of the world are unnecessarily prolonged by the belief that Chiang Kai-shek and his discredited, corrupt, military dictatorship is the true spokesman for China and that it is the policy of the United States to return Chiang Kai-shek to the mainland.

I call upon all of our citizens to take great interest in our Foreign Policy—to stimulate objective discussion without fear of the slurs and the slanders of those within our government who use the fear of Soviet Russia and Communism as a convenient way to stifle democratic discussion.

Only Adenauer Speaks in the Wildly Intransigeant Tone of the AFL-CIO

"Khrushchov has been more truculent and demanding in his aggression than Stalin. The present Kremlin course towards the problem of German reunification and Berlin is far tougher than the harshest Soviet proposals put forward under Stalin. . . .

"The latest Khrushchov proposal for so-called disarmament, within four years, continues Moscow's stubborn opposition to genuine international inspection and control. . . . The 'stages' proposed by Khrushchov are aimed at unilateral and total disarmament of our country and its democratic allies. His insistence on turning West Berlin into a so-called free city; on maintaining Soviet veto power in the Security Council; on NATO acceptance of the Soviet 'disengagement' project and 'atom free' zones; and on dismantling and eliminating America's overseas defense bases are among Moscow's gradual steps for the total disarmament of the free world. . . ."

—Policy Resolutions, AFL-CIO Convention, Sept. 1959.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nixon Names A Time-Life Admirer of Dr. Teller as His Campaign Adviser on Policy

Ike Unveils the "What's The Use of Revolting?" Theory to Chile's Students

The misery of the downtrodden often finds memorable expression but the reply of the rich and well-fed rarely makes literature. The letter the Chilean students* handed the President when he visited Santiago was eloquent; the reply given them on Mr. Eisenhower's behalf by our Ambassador to Chile is turgid, evasive and boring. But at one point in its 6,000 poorly chosen words the truth breaks through. This is in its answer to the complaint that we have looked much too benevolently on Latin America's dictators.

After a little preliminary tub-thumping on how democratic we are, the reply says "We shall continue to favor any approach to the reduction and elimination of anti-democratic governmental practices which has a real prospect of success." But, it hastens to add, "It would be nothing less than foolhardy to become so obsessed with the destruction of undemocratic regimes as to embark upon actions leading to chaos, anarchy or their replacement by a new but even more dangerous form of tyranny."

What's the Use of Revolting?

When the cellophane is unwrapped from these phrases, we find an accurate description of our attitude toward Latin American rightist dictatorships. We are not opposed, indeed we might even be said to favor, "any approach" to a *lessening* of "anti-democratic governmental practices" which "has a real prospect of success." This means in practice that if there is some way to persuade a Trujillo, a Somoza or a Batista to ease up a bit, we are all for it. But we are not "so obsessed" with dislike for these dictatorships as to venture action that might only bring "chaos" and "anarchy" (Castro?) or "a new but even more dangerous form of tyranny", i.e. Communism.

So long as a dictator plays ball with American property rights, we are loath to disturb him. It is when, as in Guatemala and Cuba, regimes appear which threaten U.S. interests and move in a socialist direction, that we unleash our thunderbolts. If Castro had made a deal with the United Fruit Company you would never have seen that 3 column page one headline in the *New York Times* of April 9, over its story on Ike's reply to the Chilean students, "President Says Castro Has Betrayed the Ideals of the Revolution."

Nixon's Revealing Choice

Some indication of Nixon's carefully hidden current political outlook may be inferred from his choice of James Shepley, head of the *Time-Life* Washington bureau, to become his aide on "policy and issues" during the campaign. Mr. Shepley will take a leave of absence from the Luce organization. His book, "The Hydrogen Bomb", (1954) was a glorification of Edward Teller and an attack on Robert Oppenheimer. Sample passage —a gem of unconscious self-parody: "Like most top theoretical physicists, cosmology was Teller's dish of tea. But curiously, Teller, the idea man, objected most strenuously to a purely conceptual approach even in broad-brush cosmology." *Gee.*

The strangest bit of political gossip floating around "the Hill", in the wake of the Wisconsin primary is that arrangements have been concluded for a Johnson-Humphrey ticket. This combination of the most conservative with the most liberal Democratic candidate would be ideal for Johnson but damaging to Humphrey. My own opinion, for what it may be worth, is that there will have to be a Catholic in the No. 2 spot on the Democratic ticket this year. The best that can be hoped for is a Stevenson-Kennedy ticket; the worst a Symington-Wagner combination. The latter would be a natural for the Truman-Acheson forces; the former would give the country a ticket firmly committed on the nuclear testing issue.

Remembering the unanimity of our press in denouncing political interference with literature in the case of Pasternak's *Dr. Zhivago,* we're waiting to see how many editorial pages will protest Frank Sinatra's dropping of Albert Maltz—one of the Hollywood Ten—as script writer for "The Execution of Private Slovik." . . . In the death of Lowell Mellett, we salute with respect and affection the passing of a grand old-timer of American liberal journalism at its best.

***Although the reply made page one headlines, the original letter was given scant attention in our press. Indeed the only place an abridged text was made available was in our issues of March 21 and 28.—IFS.**

The 1959 Index Is Ready and You Can Get A Free Copy If You Send A Stamped Self-Addressed Envelope

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

4/18/60

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED